Document 29-3

Case 3:07-cv-02328-LAB-CAB

Page 1 of 3

Filed 05/01/2008

- 4. On November 20, 2007 the decision in the underlying Due Process Hearing was rendered. The Decision held that Defendant, FALLBROOK UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT, ("the District") violated IDEA by not offering Student an opportunity to earn a high school diploma, and by not advising Student and his parents of this until June of his senior year.
- 5. The Decision erroneously delegated the award of compensatory education to the IEP Team, including the very same District personnel who had violated Student's rights in the past.
- 6. Correspondence between the District and Student was exchanged after the Decision, and the IEP team meeting was held on February 7, 2008. The only placement offer considered by the entire IEP Team at the IEP was Fallbrook High School, the public school where Student was previously denied a free, appropriate public education (FAPE). In fact, the majority of time at this UEP was spent discussing how Student would pass the California High School Exit exam (CAHSEE). This was not an issue in the underlying due process hearing, and there was directive by the Administrative Law Judge to discuss it.
- 7. Fusion Learning Center had reviewed Student's records and prepared a written statement to shared at the IEP Meeting concerning how Fusion could attempt to meet Student's needs.
- 8. Additionally, to determine the appropriate course of study for Student, when an opening for Student to attend Fusion occurred in April, 2008, Student started a trial period of 2 weeks from April 15, 2008-April 30, 2008. He made academic and social progress during this period, and has been accepted for May, 2008. Student's ability to attend Fusion, or any non-public school is dependent upon his parents' ability to pay. Student would like to have this issue resolved quickly to avoid any further interruption in his education.
- 9. The inclusion of these documents is relevant to the disposition of this case. These documents are additional to and not repetitious of any evidence previously admitted.
- 10. There has been reference made to the pendancy of this case in a class action filed in which Plaintiff in this case is currently the named Plaintiff (class representative) in the class action USDC, SDCA Case No. 08 CV 0226 W (AJB). However, these are tow completely

distinct cases, as the relief sought in the instant case would directly benefit only Student, whereas, the relief sought in the class action is intended to benefit all special education students in the State of California.

- 11. No document filed in the class action is sought to supplement the record herein. No pleading, motion or ruling in the class action should in any way affect Student' ability to obtain relief sought herein.
- 12. I respectfully request that the court permit plaintiff to supplement the record with the lodged documents, and to continue to supplement the record with similar documents until the beginning of briefing.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 1st day of May, 2008 at San Diego, California,

Ellen Dowd